

United States Patent and Trademark Office

eer

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/619,571	07/16/2003	E. Michael Ackley JR.	02280.002470.1	02280.002470.1 7101	
5514 75	10/11/2006	EXAMINER			
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			YAN, REN LUO		
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2854		
			DATE MAILED: 10/11/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/619,571	ACKLEY ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	_
		Ren L. Yan	2854	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 July</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Dispositi	ion of Claims			
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠ 8)□ Applicati 9)□ 10)□	Claim(s) 33-36,38-46,59 and 60 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) 33-36 and 38-46 is/are allowed. Claim(s) 59 and 60 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 60 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine: The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the construction of the construction	vn from consideration. r election requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objected to be the drawing(s).	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) 🗌 a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage	
2) ☐ Notic 3) ⊠ Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 6-5-2006.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te	

Art Unit: 2854

DETAILED ACTION

Claim 60 is objected to because the recitation of "the composite image" on line 12 lacks proper antecedent basis. Perhaps this recitation should be changed to "said registered image" so as to maintain consistent claim terminology. Appropriate correction is required.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 59 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 106 of copending Application No. 10/695,834.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are directed to the same invention with claim 59 of the present application being broader in scope.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim 60 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 106 of copending Application No. 10/695,834 in view of WO 91/01884. To provide the first and second printing means in claim 106 of copending application No. 10/695,834 with well known offset type printers as taught by WO 91/01884 would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 59 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 91/01884 in view of Ream et al((6,267,997).

WO 91/01884 teaches an apparatus for forming a registered image on a non-planar printing surface of a shaped edible piece 10 as claimed including a transport surface 22 with at least one shaped recess 23 having a non-planar surface corresponding to the shaped edible piece and a vacuum hole 29 positioned within and at the deepest portion of the shaped recess for holding the edible piece 10 laterally, longitudinally and rotationally within the shaped recess at a predetermined position, a first offset printer station 35 at a first position along a transport path that forms a first component image in ink on the shaped piece while in the predetermined position, a second printer station 41(laser marking system 41) downstream from the first printer station that forms a second component of a registered image on the edible piece 10 in registration with the first component image of the registered image, and a vacuum pump to supply vacuum to

Art Unit: 2854

the vacuum hole 29 to maintain the edible piece in the predetermined position within the recess while the edible piece is at and between the first and second print stations such that multiple printing operations can be performed in proper registration on the edible piece. Additionally, the broad means for applying a pressure differential to the vacuum hole to maintain the edible piece in the predetermined position within the recess while the edible piece is at and between the first and second printer stations as recited in claim 59 and the vacuum pump and means for allocating pressure differential applied to the edible piece at and between the first and second printer stations as recited in claim 60 read on the vacuum pump and the vacuum chambers 27 and 28 as taught in WO 91/01884. See Figs. 1-3 and pages 8 and 9 of WO 91/01884 for details. However, the second printer station of WO 91/01884 does not apply the second component image of a registered image in ink as recited. The patent to Ream et al teach the conventionality of printing on edible pieces a registered image formed with first and second components of colored ink in proper registration by first and second printers 32. See Figs. 10, 11, column 5, lines 12-15 and column 8, lines 46-59 in Ream et al for example. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the printing apparatus of WO 91/01884 with a second offset ink printing device appropriately disposed as taught by Ream et al in order to form a multicolor ink registered image on the tablet piece.

Claims 33-36 and 38-46 are allowed.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 59 and 60 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Application/Control Number: 10/619,571

Art Unit: 2854

Page 5

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ren L. Yan whose telephone number is 571-272-2173. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2854

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ren L Yan

Primary Examiner Art Unit 2854

Page 6

Ren Yan September 20, 2006